

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/619,515 07/16/2003		Toshihiro Sasaya	104681.03	7519
25944	7590 05/06/2004		EXAMINER	
	ERRIDGE, PLC	BRAUN, FRED L		
P.O. BOX 19928 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2852	
			DATE MAILED: 05/06/2004	1

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application	on No.	Applicant(s)			
		10/619,51	15	SASAYA ET AL.			
		Examiner		Art Unit			
		Fred L. B	raun	2852			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on the	cover sheet with th	ne correspondence add	ress		
A SH THE - Exte after - If the - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAT nsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) day period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory tree to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the dipatent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	CFR 1.136(a). In no evention. Is, a reply within the state period will apply and will y statute, cause the app	ent, however, may a reply butory minimum of thirty (30) Il expire SIX (6) MONTHS lication to become ABAND	pe timely filed) days will be considered timely, from the mailing date of this comoned (35 U.S.C. § 133).	nmunication.		
Status							
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	n <u>16 July 2003</u> .					
2a) <u></u> ☐	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.						
3)	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims	·					
4) \(\times \) 5) \(\times \) 6) \(\times \) 7) \(\times \) 8) \(\times \) Applicat 9) \(\times \) 10) \(\times \)	Claim(s) 17-132 is/are pending in the ap 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are w Claim(s) 17-95 and 107-113 is/are allow Claim(s) 96-106 and 114-132 is/are rejected to. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction tion Papers The specification is objected to by the Ex The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)[Applicant may not request that any objection Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the	ithdrawn from coned. cted. and/or election recaminer. accepted or b) to the drawing(s) becorrection is require	equirement. objected to by the held in abeyance. ed if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFF	, ,		
•—	The oath or declaration is objected to by	tile Examiner. No	ne the attached On	ide Action of form Fire	J-102.		
12)⊠ a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority doct 2. Certified copies of the priority doct 3. Copies of the certified copies of the application from the International I	uments have bee uments have bee e priority docume Bureau (PCT Rul	n received. n received in Applicents have been received 17.2(a)).	cation No. <u>08/360,515</u> . eived in this National S			
2) Notice (3) Infor	et(s) Dee of References Cited (PTO-892) Dee of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9) The mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO) The No(s)/Mail Date 7/16/03.		4) Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 5) Notice of Inform 6) Other:		.152)		

Application/Control Number: 10/619,515

Art Unit: 2852

- 1. The lengthy specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors. Applicant's cooperation is requested in correcting any errors of which applicant may become aware in the specification.
- 2. In view of the submission of new claims 107-132 in the preliminary amendment of July 16, 2003 which differ in scope from the originally filed claims 1-16, a supplemental oath or declaration which is in compliance with 37 CFR 1.63(b)(2) and 37 CFR 1.67(b), respectively, is required.
- 3. Claims 96-106 and 114-132 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. ***.

With respect to claims 96-106 there appears to be no basis in the original disclosure for the method of manufacturing a projection optical system and/or an exposure apparatus which includes the steps of (1) "determining a first rotate angle"; (2) "determining a second rotate angle"; and (3) "determining a third rotate angle"; recited on lines 4-12 of base claim 96 and lines 9-14 of base claim 101, respectively, thereby rendering said claims and any claims dependent thereon as being directed to new matter. Assuming arguendo that there is basis in the original disclosure for the claim language noted supra, the terms and phrases used in the claims must find clear antecedent basis and/or support in the specification as required by 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

Application/Control Number: 10/619,515

Art Unit: 2852

Applicants allegation on page 25 of their remarks filed on July 16, 2003 that there is basis on lines 10-16 of page 43 of their original specification for the claim language noted supra is not deemed persuasive since the terms and/or expressions used in said claims have no clear antecedent basis and/or support in the original specification noted in applicants remarks. As to claims 114-116, there appears to be no basis in applicants original specification for the apparatus, recited on lines 12 and 13 of base claim 114, and/or method steps, recited on lines 9 and 10 of base claim 116, respectively, for changing the focal length of a first optical unit and a second optical unit without moving or rotating the first and second optical units thereby constituting claims that are directed to new matter. Applicants allegation on page 25 of their remarks filed July 16, 2003 that lines 9-11 on page 14 of their original specification supports the language in base claims 114 and 116, respectively, for example, is not deemed sufficient. Claims 117-132 are considered to be directed to new matter since lines 8-12 on page 44 of applicants original specification, as alleged by applicants on page 25 of their remarks filed on July 16, 2003, fails to disclose the "pressure control unit", recited on lines 11 and 12 of base claims 117 and 119, respectively, thereby rendering said base claims and any claims dependent thereon as being directed to new matter. Moreover, the method step of controlling a pressure between constituent lenses of the projection optical system, recited on lines 8 and 9 of method base claim 124 and lines 7 and 8 of method base claim 126, respectively, is also not disclosed in applicants original specification thereby rendering base claims 124 and 126 and any claims dependent thereon as being directed to new matter. Assuming arguendo that there is basis in the

Application/Control Number: 10/619,515 Page 4

Art Unit: 2852

original disclosure for the claim language noted supra, then the terms and phrases used in the claims must have clear antecedent basis and/or support in the specification as required by 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1).

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Fred L Braun at telephone number (571) 272-2132.

Grad L Braun FRED L' BRAUN PRIMARY EXAMINER ART UNIT 2852